Estimation of block sparsity in compressive sensing

Zhiyong Zhou*, Jun Yu
Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Umeå University,
Umeå, 901 87, Sweden

January 5, 2017

arXiv:1701.01055v1 [stat.AP] 4 Jan 2017

Abstract: In this paper, we consider a soft measure of block sparsity, $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = (\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}/\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1})^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}, \alpha \in [0,\infty]$ and propose a procedure to estimate it by using multivariate isotropic symmetric α-stable random projections without sparsity or block sparsity assumptions. The limiting distribution of the estimator is given. Some simulations are conducted to illustrate our theoretical results.

Keywords: Block sparsity; Multivariate isotropic symmetric α-stable distribution; Compressive sensing; Characteristic function.

1 Introduction

Since its introduction a few years ago [4, 5, 6, 9], Compressive Sensing (CS) has attracted considerable interests (see the monographs [12, 15] for a comprehensive view). Formally, one considers the standard CS model,

$$\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \varepsilon, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 1}$ is the measurements, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times N}$ is the measurement matrix, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the unknown signal, ε is the measurement error, and $m \ll N$. The goal of CS is to recover the unknown signal $\mathbf{x}$ by using only the underdetermined measurements $\mathbf{y}$ and the matrix A. Under the assumption of sparsity of the signal, that is $\mathbf{x}$ has only a few nonzero entries, and the measurement matrix A is properly chosen, $\mathbf{x}$ can be recovered from $\mathbf{y}$ by a lot of algorithms, such as the Basis Pursuit (BP), or ℓ_1-minimization approach, the Orthogonal Matching Pursuit (OMP) [28], Compressive sampling matching pursuit (CoSaMP) [23] and the Iterative Harding Thresholding algorithm [2]. Specifically, when the sparsity level of the signal $\mathbf{x}$ is $s = \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = \text{card}\{j : x_j \neq 0\}$, if $m \geq Cs\ln(N/s)$ with some universal constant C, A is subgaussian random matrix, then accurate or robust recovery can be guaranteed with high probability.

The sparsity level parameter s plays a fundamental role in CS, as the number of measurements, the properties of measurement matrix A, and even some recovery algorithms all involves it. However, the sparsity level of the signal is usually unknown in practice. To fill the gap between theory and practice, very recently [16, 17] proposed a numerically stable measure of sparsity $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\alpha}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$, which is in ratios of norms. By random linear projection using i.i.d univariate symmetric α-stable random variables, the author constructed the estimation equation for the parameter with the characteristic function method and obtained the asymptotic normality of the estimators.

*Corresponding author, zhiyong.zhou@umu.se.

As a natural extension of the sparsity with nonzero entries arbitrarily spread throughout the signal, we can consider the sparse signals exhibit additional structure in the form of the nonzero entries occurring in clusters. Such signals are referred to as block-sparse [10, 11, 13]. Block sparsity model appears in many practical scenarios, such as when dealing with multi-band signals [22] or in measurements of gene expression levels [25]. Moreover, block sparsity model can be used to treat the problems of multiple measurement vector (MMV) [7, 8, 13, 21] and sampling signals that lie in a union of subspaces [3, 13, 22].

To make explicit use of the block structure to achieve better sparse recovery performance, the corresponding extended versions of sparse representation algorithms have been developed, such as mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1-norm recovery algorithm [11, 13, 27], group lasso [29] or adaptive group lasso [18], iterative reweighted ℓ_2/ℓ_1 recovery algorithms [30], block version of OMP algorithm [11] and the extensions of the CoSaMP algorithm and of the Iterative Hard Thresholding to the model-based setting [1], which includes block-sparsity as a special case. It was shown in [13] that if the measurement matrix A has small block-restricted isometry constants which generalizes the conventional RIP notion, then the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1-norm recovery algorithm is guaranteed to recover any block-sparse signal, irrespectively of the locations of the nonzero blocks. Furthermore, recovery will be robust in the presence of noise and modeling errors (i.e., when the vector is not exactly block-sparse). [1] showed that the block versions of CoSaMP and Iterative Hard Thresholding exhibit provable recovery guarantees and robustness properties. In addition, with the block-coherence of A is small, the robust recovery of mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1-norm method, and the block version of the OMP algorithm are guaranteed in [11].

The block sparsity level plays the same central role in recovery for block-sparse signals as the sparsity level in recovery for sparse signals. And, in practice, the block-sparsity level of the signals are also unknown. To obtain its estimator is very important from both the theoretical and practical views. In this paper, as a extension of the sparsity estimation in [16, 17], we consider a stable measure of block sparsity and obtain its estimator by using multivariate isotropic symmetric α-stable random projection. When the block size is 1, then our estimation procedure reduces to the case considered in [17]. To estimate the conventional sparsity, the author used the random projection by i.i.d univariate symmetric α-stable random projection. While, to estimate the block sparsity, we need the multivariate isotropic symmetric α-stable random projection, and the components in the multivariate random vectors are dependent, except in multivariate normal case. With minor modification, the limiting distributions of the estimators can be obtained similar to the results presented in [17].

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the definition of block sparsity and the soft measure of block sparsity. In Section 3, we present the estimation procedure for the block sparsity and obtain the limiting results for the estimators. In Section 4, we conduct some simulations to illustrate the theoretical results. Section 5 is devoted to the conclusion. Finally, the proofs are postponed to the Appendix.

Throughout the paper, we denote vectors by boldface lower letters e.g., $\mathbf{x}$, and matrices by upper letters e.g., A. Vectors are columns by default. $\mathbf{x}^T$ is the transpose of the vector $\mathbf{x}$. For any vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we denote the ℓ_p-norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p = (\sum_{j=1}^{N} |x_j|^p)^{1/p}$ for $p > 0$. $I(\cdot)$ is the indicative function. E is the expectation function. $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the bracket function, which takes the maximum integer value. $\mathrm{Re}(\cdot)$ is the real part function. i is the imaginary unit. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product of two vectors. $\xrightarrow{p}$ indicates convergence in probability, while $\xrightarrow{d}$ is convergence in distribution.

2 Block Sparsity Measures

In this section, we firstly introduce some basic concepts for block sparsity and propose a new measure of block sparsity. With $N = \sum_{j=1}^{p} d_j$, we define the j-th subblock $\mathbf{x}[j]$ of a length-N vector $\mathbf{x}$ over $\mathcal{I} = \{d_1, \cdots, d_p\}$. The j-th subblock is of length d_j, and the blocks are formed sequentially so the

$$\mathbf{x} = (\underbrace{x_1 \cdots x_{d_1}}_{\mathbf{x}^T[1]} \underbrace{x_{d_1+1} \cdots x_{d_1+d_2}}_{\mathbf{x}^T[2]} \cdots \underbrace{x_{N-d_p+1} \cdots x_N}_{\mathbf{x}^T[p]})^T. \tag{2.1}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $d_1 = d_2 = \cdots = d_p = d$, then $N = pd$. A vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is called block k-sparse over $\mathcal{I} = \{d, \cdots, d\}$ if $\mathbf{x}[j]$ is nonzero for at most k indices j. In other words, by denoting

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} I(\|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 > 0),$$

a bock k-sparse vector $\mathbf{x}$ can be defined by $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0} \leq k$.

Despite the important theoretical role of the parameter $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$, it has a severe practical drawback of being sensitive to small entries of $\mathbf{x}$. To overcome this drawback, it is desirable to replace the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_0 norm with a soft version. Specifically, we generalize the sparsity measure based on entropy to the block sparsity measure. For any non-zero signal $\mathbf{x}$ given in (2.1), it induces a distribution $\pi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ on the set of block indices $\{1, \cdots, p\}$, assigning mass $\pi_j(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 / \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}$ at index $j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$, where $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2$. Then the entropy based block sparsity goes to

$$k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{exp}(H_\alpha(\pi(\mathbf{x}))) & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where H_α is the Rényi entropy of order $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$. When $\alpha \notin \{0, 1, \infty\}$, the Rényi entropy is given explicitly by $H_\alpha(\pi(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln(\sum_{j=1}^{p} \pi_j(\mathbf{x})^\alpha)$, and the cases of $\alpha \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ are defined by evaluating limits, with H_1 being the ordinary Shannon entropy. Then, for $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\alpha \notin \{0, 1, \infty\}$, we have the measure of block sparsity written conveniently in terms of mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_α norm as

$$k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}},$$

where the mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_α norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2^\alpha \right)^{1/\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 0$. The cases of $\alpha \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ are evaluated as limits: $k_0(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\alpha \to 0} k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$, $k_1(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\alpha \to 1} k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \mathsf{exp}(H_1(\pi(\mathbf{x})))$, and $k_\infty(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\alpha \to \infty} k_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty}}$, where $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2$. When the block size d equals 1, then our block sparsity measure $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ reduces to the conventional sparsity measure $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_\alpha}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_1} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}$ given by [17]. The quantity $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ has the some important properties similar as $s_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$, such as the continuity, range equal to $[0, p]$, scale-invariance and non-increasing in α. It is a sensible measure of block sparsity for non-idealized signals.

Before presenting the estimation procedure for the $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, we give the block sparse signal recovery results in terms of $k_2(\mathbf{x})$ by using mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1-norm optimization algorithm.

To recover the block sparse signal in CS model (1.1), we use the following mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_1-norm optimization algorithm proposed in [11, 13]:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|\mathbf{e}\|_{2,1}, \text{ subject to } \|\mathbf{y} - A\mathbf{e}\|_2 \leq \epsilon, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\epsilon \geq 0$ is a upper bound on the noise level $\|\varepsilon\|_2$. Then, we have the following result concerning on the robust recovery for block sparse signals.

Lemma 1.[13] Let $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \varepsilon$ be noisy measurements of a vector $\mathbf{x}$ and fix a number $k \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$. Let $\mathbf{x}^k$ denote the best block k-sparse approximation of $\mathbf{x}$, such that $\mathbf{x}^k$ is block k-sparse and minimizes $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}\|_{2,1}$ over all the block k-sparse vectors $\mathbf{f}$, and let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be a solution to (2.3), a random Gaussian matrix A of size $m \times N$ with entries $A_{ij} \sim N(0, \frac{1}{m})$, and block sparse signals over $\mathcal{I} = \{d_1 = d, \cdots, d_p = d\}$, where $N = pd$ for some integer p. Then, there are constants $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$, such that the following statement is true. If $m \geq c_0 k \ln(eN/kd)$, then with probability at least $1 - 2\mathsf{exp}(-c_1 m)$, we have

$$\frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} \leq c_2 \frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^k\|_{2,1}}{\sqrt{k}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} + c_3 \frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}. \tag{2.4}$$

Remark 1. Note that the first term in (2.4) is a result of the fact that $\mathbf{x}$ is not exactly k-block sparse, while the second term quantifies the recovery error due to the measurement noise. When the block size $d = 1$, then this Lemma goes to the conventional CS result for sparse signals. Explicit use of block sparsity reduces the required number of measurements from $\mathrm{O}(kd\ln(eN/kd))$ to $\mathrm{O}(k\ln(eN/kd))$ by d times.

Next, we present an upper bound of the relative ℓ_2-error by an explicit function of m and the new proposed block sparsity measure $k_2(\mathbf{x})$. Its proof is left to Appendix.

Lemma 2. Let $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} + \varepsilon$ be noisy measurements of a vector $\mathbf{x}$, and let $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ be a solution to (2.3), a random Gaussian matrix A of size $m \times N$ with entries $A_{ij} \sim N(0, \frac{1}{m})$, and block sparse signals over $\mathcal{I} = \{d_1 = d, \cdots, d_n = d\}$, where $N = pd$ for some integer p. Then, there are constants $\kappa_0, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3 > 0$, such that the following statement is true. If m and N satisfy $\kappa_0 \ln(\kappa_0 \frac{eN}{m}) \leq m \leq N$, then with probability at least $1 - 2\mathsf{exp}(-\kappa_1 m)$, we have

$$\frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} \leq \kappa_2 \sqrt{\frac{k_2(\mathbf{x}) d \ln(\frac{eN}{m})}{m}} + \kappa_3 \frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2}. \tag{2.5}$$

3 Estimation Method for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$

The core idea to obtain the estimators for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ is using random projection. Contrast with the conventional sparsity estimation by using univariate symmetric α-stable random variables [17, 31], we use the multivariate isotropic symmetric α-stable random vectors [24, 26] for the block sparsity estimation. Specifically, we firstly give the definition of the multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α-stable distribution.

Definition 1. For $d \geq 1$, a d-dimensional random vector $\mathbf{v}$ has a centered isotropic symmetric α-stable distribution if there are constants $\gamma > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ such that its characteristic function has the form

$$E[\mathsf{exp}(\mathrm{i}\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{v})] = \mathsf{exp}(-\gamma^\alpha \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^\alpha), \text{ for all } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.1}$$

We denote the distribution by $\mathbf{v} \sim S(d, \alpha, \gamma)$, and γ is referred to as the scale parameter.

Remark 2. The most well-known examples of multivariate isotropic symmetric stable distribution are the case of $\alpha = 2$ (Multivariate Independent Gaussian Distribution), and in this case, the components of the Multivariate Gaussian random vector are independent. Another case is $\alpha = 1$ (Multivariate Spherical Symmetric Cauchy Distribution [26]), unlike Multivariate Independent Gaussian case, the components of Multivariate spherical Cauchy are uncorrelated, but dependent. The multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α-stable random vector is a direct extension of the univariate symmetric α-stable random variable, which is the special case when the dimension parameter $d = 1$. By random projection using i.i.d multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α-stable random vectors, we can obtain the estimators for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}$ and $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, which will be presented in the followings.

We estimate the $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}$ by using the random linear projection measurements:

$$y_i = \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle + \sigma \varepsilon_i, \;\; i = 1, 2, \cdots, n, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{a}_i = (\mathbf{a}_{i1}^T, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, \alpha, \gamma)$. The noise term ε_i are i.i.d from a distribution F_0 and assume its characteristic function is φ_0, the sets $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$ and $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$ are independent. $\{\varepsilon_i, i = 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ are assumed to be symmetric about 0, with $0 < E|\varepsilon_1| < \infty$, but they may have infinite variance. The assumption of symmetry is only for convenience, it was explained how to drop it in Section III-B2.e of [17]. A minor technical condition we place on F_0 is that the roots of its characteristic function φ_0 are isolated (i.e. no limit points). This condition is satisfied by many families of distributions, such as Gaussian, Students t, Laplace, uniform[a, b], and stable laws. And we assume that the noise scale parameter $\sigma > 0$ and the distribution F_0 are treated as being known for simplicity.

Since our work involves different choices of α, we will write γ_α instead of γ. Then the link of the norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}$ hinges on the following basic lemma.

Lemma 3. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}[1]^T, \cdots, \mathbf{x}[p]^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be fixed, and suppose $\mathbf{a}_1 = (\mathbf{a}_{11}^T, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_{1p}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{1j}, j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and $\gamma_\alpha > 0$. Then, the random variable $\langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ has the distribution $S(1, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha})$.

Remark 3. When $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}[1]^T, \cdots, \mathbf{x}[p]^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ has different block lengths which are $\{d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_p\}$ respectively, then we need choose the projection random vector $\mathbf{a}_1 = (\mathbf{a}_{11}^T, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_{1p}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{1j}, j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d_j, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha)$. In that case, the conclusion in our Lemma and all the results in the followings still hold without any modifications. This Lemma is a direct extension of Lemma 1 in [17] from i.i.d univariate symmetric α-stable projection to i.i.d multivariate isotropic symmetric α-stable projection.

By using this result, if we generate a set of i.i.d measurement random vectors $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$ as given above and let $\tilde{y}_i = \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle$, then $\{\tilde{y}_1, \cdots, \tilde{y}_n\}$ is an i.i.d sample from the distribution $S(1, \alpha, \gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha})$. Hence, in the special case of random linear measurements without noise, estimating the norm $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}$ reduces to estimating the scale parameter of a univariate stable distribution from an i.i.d sample.

Next, we present the estimation procedure by using characteristic functions [17, 19, 20]. We use two separate sets of measurements to estimate $\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}$ and $\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}}$. The respective sample sizes of each measurements are denoted by n_1 and n_α. To unify the discussion, we will describe just the procedure to obtain $\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}}$ for

any $\alpha \in (0,2]$, since $\alpha = 1$ is a special case. The two estimators are combined to obtain the estimator for $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$, which follows as:

$$\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\left(\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}{\left(\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}} \tag{3.3}$$

In fact, the characteristic function of y_i has the form:

$$\Psi(t) = E[\mathsf{exp}(\mathrm{i}ty_i)] = \mathsf{exp}(-\gamma_\alpha^\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha |t|^\alpha) \cdot \varphi_0(\sigma t), \tag{3.4}$$

where $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha = -\frac{1}{\gamma_\alpha^\alpha |t|^\alpha} \log |\mathrm{Re}(\frac{\Psi(t)}{\varphi_0(\sigma t)})|$. By using the empirical characteristic function

$$\hat{\Psi}_{n_\alpha}(t) = \frac{1}{n_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} e^{ity_i}$$

to estimate $\Psi(t)$, we obtain the estimator of $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ given by

$$\widehat{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^{\alpha}} =: \hat{v}_\alpha(t) = -\frac{1}{\gamma_\alpha^\alpha |t|^\alpha} \log \left| \mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\hat{\Psi}_{n_\alpha}(t)}{\varphi_0(\sigma t)} \right) \right|, \tag{3.5}$$

when $t \neq 0$ and $\varphi_0(\sigma t) \neq 0$.

Then, similar to the Theorem 2 in [17], we have the Uniform CLT for $\hat{v}_\alpha(t)$. We introduce the noise-to-signal ratio constant

$$\rho_\alpha = \frac{\sigma}{\gamma_\alpha \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}}.$$

Theorem 1. Let $\alpha \in (0,2]$. Let $\hat{t}$ be any function of $\{y_1, \cdots, y_{n_\alpha}\}$ that satisfies

$$\gamma_\alpha \hat{t} \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha} \xrightarrow{p} c_\alpha, \tag{3.6}$$

as $(n_\alpha, N) \to \infty$ for some finite constant $c_\alpha \neq 0$ and $\varphi_0(\rho_\alpha c_\alpha) \neq 0$. Then, we have

$$\sqrt{n_\alpha} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha)) \tag{3.7}$$

as $(n_\alpha, N) \to \infty$, where the limiting variance $\theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha)$ is strictly positive and defined according to the formula

$$\theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha) = \frac{1}{|c_\alpha|^{2\alpha}} \left(\frac{\mathsf{exp}(2|c_\alpha|^\alpha)}{2\varphi_0(\rho_\alpha |c_\alpha|)^2} + \frac{\varphi_0(2\rho_\alpha |c_\alpha|)}{2\varphi_0(\rho_\alpha |c_\alpha|)^2} \mathsf{exp}((2 - 2^\alpha)|c_\alpha|^\alpha) - 1 \right).$$

For simplicity, we use the $\hat{t}_{\mathrm{pilot}}$ instead of the optimal $\hat{t}_{\mathrm{opt}}$ in [17]. Since it is simple to implement, and still gives a reasonably good estimator. To describe the pilot value, let $\eta_0 > 0$ be any number such that $\varphi_0(\eta) > \frac{1}{2}$ for all $\eta \in [0, \eta_0]$ (which exists for any characteristic function). Also, define the median absolute deviation statistic $\hat{m}_\alpha = \mathrm{median}\{|y_1|, \cdots, |y_{n_\alpha}|\}$. Then we define $\hat{t}_{\mathrm{pilot}} = \min\{\frac{1}{\hat{m}_\alpha}, \frac{\eta_0}{\sigma}\}$. Then we obtain the consistent estimator $\hat{c}_\alpha = \gamma_\alpha \hat{t}_{\mathrm{pilot}} [\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\mathrm{pilot}})]^{1/\alpha}$ of a constant $c_\alpha = \min\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{median}(|S_1 + \rho_\alpha \varepsilon_1|)}, \frac{\eta_0}{\rho_\alpha} \right)$, where random variable $S_1 \sim S(1,1,1)$ (see the Proposition 3 in [17]), and the consistent estimator of ρ_α, $\hat{\rho}_\alpha = \frac{\sigma}{\gamma_\alpha [\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\mathrm{pilot}})]^{1/\alpha}}$.

Therefore, the consistent estimator of the limiting variance $\theta_\alpha(c_\alpha, \rho_\alpha)$ is $\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)$. Thus, we immediately have the following corollary to obtain the confidence intervals for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$.

Corollary 1. Under the conditions of Theorem 1, as $(n_\alpha, N) \to \infty$, we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{n_\alpha}{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1). \tag{3.8}$$

As a consequence, the asymptotic $1-\beta$ confidence interval for $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}^\alpha$ is

$$\left[\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}{n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2} \right) \hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}}), \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}{n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2} \right) \hat{v}_\alpha(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}}) \right], \tag{3.9}$$

where $z_{1-\beta/2}$ is the $1-\beta/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution.

Then we can obtain a CLT and a confidence interval for $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ by combining the estimators $\hat{v}_\alpha$ and $\hat{v}_1$ with their respective $\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}}$. Before we present the main result, for each $\alpha \in (0,2] \setminus \{1\}$, we assume that there is a constant $\bar{\pi}_\alpha \in (0,1)$, such that $(n_1, n_\alpha, N) \to \infty$,

$$\pi_\alpha := \frac{n_\alpha}{n_1 + n_\alpha} = \bar{\pi}_\alpha + o(n_\alpha^{-1/2}).$$

Theorem 2. Let $\alpha \in (0,2] \setminus \{1\}$, and the conditions of Theorem 1 hold, then as $(n_1, n_\alpha, N) \to \infty$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{n_1 + n_\alpha}{\hat{w}_\alpha}} \left(\frac{\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0,1), \tag{3.10}$$

where $\hat{w}_\alpha = \frac{\theta_\alpha(\hat{c}_\alpha, \hat{\rho}_\alpha)}{\pi_\alpha} (\frac{1}{1-\alpha})^2 + \frac{\theta_1(\hat{c}_1, \hat{\rho}_1)}{1-\pi_\alpha} (\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha})^2$. And consequently, the asymptotic $1-\beta$ confidence interval for $k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ is

$$\left[\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\hat{w}_\alpha}{n_1 + n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2} \right) \hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}), \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{\hat{w}_\alpha}{n_1 + n_\alpha}} z_{1-\beta/2} \right) \hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \right], \tag{3.11}$$

where $z_{1-\beta/2}$ is the $1-\beta/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution.

Next, we present the approximation of $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ to $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ when α is close to 0. To state the theorem, we define the block dynamic range of a non-zero signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ given in (2.1) as

$$\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\infty}}{|\mathbf{x}|_{2,\min}}, \tag{3.12}$$

where $|\mathbf{x}|_{2,\min}$ is the smallest ℓ_2 norm of the non-zero block of $\mathbf{x}$, i.e. $|\mathbf{x}|_{2,\min} = \min\{\|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2 : \mathbf{x}[j] \neq \mathbf{0}, j = 1, \cdots, p\}$. The following result involves no randomness and is applicable to any estimator $\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$.

Theorem 3. Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is non-zero signal given in (2.1), and let $\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ be any real number. Then, we have

$$\left| \frac{\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \frac{\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})}{k_\alpha(\mathbf{x})} - 1 \right| + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \Big(\ln(\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x})) + \alpha \ln(\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}) \Big). \tag{3.13}$$

Remark 4. The theorem is a direct extension of Proposition 5 in [17], which corresponds the special case of the block size $d = 1$. When choosing $\tilde{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ to be the proposed estimator $\hat{k}_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$, the first term in (3.13) is already controlled by Theorem 2. As pointed out in [17], the second term is the approximation error that improves for smaller choices of α. When the ℓ_2 norms of the signal blocks are similar, the quantity of $\ln(\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}))$ will not be too large. In this case, the bound behaves well and estimating $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ is of interest. On the other hand, if the ℓ_2 norms of the signal blocks are very different, that is $\ln(\text{BDNR}(\mathbf{x}))$ is large, then $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,0}$ may not be the best measure of block sparsity to estimate.

4 Simulation

In this section, we conduct some simulations to illustrate our theoretical results. We focus on choosing $\alpha = 2$, that is we use $\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})$ to estimate the block sparsity measure $k_2(\mathbf{x})$. When estimating $k_2(\mathbf{x})$, we requires a set of n_1 measurements by using multivariate isotropic symmetric cauchy projection, and a set of n_2 by using multivariate isotropic symmetric normal projection. We generated the samples $\mathbf{y}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $\mathbf{y}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ according to

$$\mathbf{y}_1 = A_1\mathbf{x} + \sigma\varepsilon_1 \text{ and } \mathbf{y}_2 = A_2\mathbf{x} + \sigma\varepsilon_2, \tag{4.1}$$

where $A_1 = (\mathbf{a}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_{n_1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times N}$, with $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{a}_i = (\mathbf{a}_{i1}^T, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, 1, \gamma_1)$, we let $\gamma_1 = 1$. Similarly, $A_2 = (\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{n_2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times N}$, with $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is i.i.d random vector, and $\mathbf{b}_i = (\mathbf{b}_{i1}^T, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{ip}^T)^T$ with $\mathbf{b}_{ij}, j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$ i.i.d drawn from $S(d, 2, \gamma_2)$, we let $\gamma_2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$. The noise terms ε_1 and ε_2 are generated with i.i.d entries from a standard normal distribution. We considered a sequence of pairs for the sample sizes $(n_1, n_2) = (50, 50), (100, 100), (200, 200), \cdots, (500, 500)$. For each experiments, we replicates 500 times. Then, we have 500 realizations of $\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})$ for each (n_1, n_2). We then averaged the quantity $|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1|$ as an approximation of $E|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1|$.

We let our signal $\mathbf{x}$ be a very simple block sparse vector, that is

$$\mathbf{x} = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}\mathbf{1}_{10}^T, \mathbf{0}_{N-10}^T)^T,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_q$ is a vector of length q with entries all ones, $\mathbf{0}_q$ is the zero vector. Then it is obvious that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2} = 1$, while $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}$ and $k_2(\mathbf{x})$ depend on the block size d that we choose. We set $\eta_0 = 1$. The simulation is conducted under several choices of the parameters, N, d and σ–with each parameter corresponding to a separate plot in Figure 1. The signal dimension N is set to 1000, except in the top left plot, where $N = 20, 100, 500, 1000$. We set $d = 5$ in all cases, except in top right plot, where $d = 1, 2, 5, 10$, corresponding the real value $k_2(\mathbf{x}) = 10, 5, 2, 1$, which is also the exact block sparsity level of our signal $\mathbf{x}$ with the block size to be d. In turn, $\sigma = 0.1$ in all cases, except in the bottom plot where $\sigma = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$. In all three plots, the theoretical curves are computed in the following way. From Theorem 2, we have $|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1| \approx \frac{\sqrt{\omega_2}}{\sqrt{n_1+n_2}}|Z|$, where Z is a standard Gaussian random variable, and we set $\omega_2 = \frac{\theta_2(c_2,\rho_2)}{\pi_2} + 4\frac{\theta_1(c_1,\rho_1)}{1-\pi_2}$. Since $E|Z| = \sqrt{2/\pi}$, the theoretical curves are simply $\frac{\sqrt{2\omega_2/\pi}}{\sqrt{n_1+n_2}}$, as a function of $n_1 + n_2$. Note that ω_2 depends on σ and d, which is why there is only one theoretical curve in top left plot for error dependence on N.

From Figure 1, we can see that the black theoretical curves agree well with the colored empirical ones. In addition, the averaged relative error has no observable dependence on N or d (when σ is fixed), as expected from Theorem 2. The dependence on the σ is mild, except in the case $\sigma = 0.5$ which is a bit large.

Next, a simulation study is conducted to illustrate the asymptotic normality of our estimators in Corollary 1 and Theorem 2. We have 1000 replications for these experiments, that is we have 1000 sam-

ples of the standardized statistics res1 $= \sqrt{\frac{n_1}{\theta_1(\hat{c}_1,\hat{\rho}_1)}}\left(\frac{\hat{v}_1(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}}-1\right)$, res2 $= \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{\theta_2(\hat{c}_2,\hat{\rho}_2)}}\left(\frac{\hat{v}_2(\hat{t}_{\text{pilot}})}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2}^2}-1\right)$ and res $= \sqrt{\frac{n_1+n_2}{\hat{w}_2}}\left(\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})}-1\right)$. We consider four cases, with $(n_1, n_2) = (200, 200), (400, 400)$ and the noise is standard normal and $t(2)$ which has infinite variance. In all the cases, we set $N = 1000$, $d = 5$, and $\sigma = 0.1$.

Figure 2 shows that the density curves of the standardized statistics all are very close to the standard normal density curve, which verified our theoretical results. And these results hold even when the noise distribution is heavy-tailed. Comparing the four plots, we see that it leads to improve the normal approximation by increasing the sample size $n_1 + n_2$ and reducing the noise variance.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a random projection method by using multivariate centered isotropic symmetric α-stable random vectors to estimate the block sparsity without sparsity or block sparsity assumptions. The asymptotic properties of the estimators were obtained. Some simulation experiments illustrated our theoretical results.

Appendix A Proofs

Our main theoretical results Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 follow directly from Theorem 2 and Corollary 1 in [17], since in both estimation procedures, the measurements without noise both have the univariate symmetric stable distribution but with different scale parameters after the random projection, $\gamma_\alpha\|\mathbf{x}\|_\alpha$ for sparsity estimation, $\gamma_\alpha\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha}$ for block-sparsity estimation. Therefore, the asymptotic results for the scale parameters estimators by using characteristic function method are almost the same. In addition, Theorem 3 follows from Proposition 5 in [17] with some minor modifications. In order not to repeat, all the details are omitted. Next, we only present the proofs for Lemma 2 and Lemma 3.

Proof of Lemma 2. Let c_0 be as in Lemma 1, and let $\kappa_0 \geq 1$ be any number such that

$$\frac{2\ln(\kappa_0)+2}{d\kappa_0}+\frac{2}{\kappa_0}\leq\frac{1}{c_0}. \tag{A.1}$$

Define the positive number $t = \frac{m/\kappa_0}{d\ln(\frac{eN}{m})}$, and choose $k = \lfloor t \rfloor$ in Lemma 1. Note that when $m \leq N$, this choice of k is clearly at most p, and hence lies in $\{1, \cdots, p\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
k\ln(\frac{eN}{kd}) &\leq (t+1)\ln(\frac{eN}{td}) \\
&= \left(\frac{m/\kappa_0}{d\ln(\frac{eN}{m})}+1\right)\cdot\ln\left(\frac{\kappa_0 eN}{m}\cdot\ln(\frac{eN}{m})\right) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{m/\kappa_0}{d\ln(\frac{eN}{m})}+1\right)\cdot\ln\left[(\kappa_0\frac{eN}{m})^2\right] \\
&= \frac{2m/\kappa_0}{d\ln(\frac{eN}{m})}\left(\ln(\kappa_0)+\ln(\frac{eN}{m})\right)+2\ln(\kappa_0\frac{eN}{m}) \\
&\leq \left(\frac{2\ln(\kappa_0)+2}{d\kappa_0}+\frac{2}{\kappa_0}\right)m\leq\frac{m}{c_0}
\end{aligned}$$

by using our assumption $N \geq m \geq \kappa_0\ln(\kappa_0\frac{eN}{m})$. Hence, our choice of κ_0 ensures $m \geq c_0 k\ln(eN/kd)$. To finish the proof, let $\kappa_1 = c_1$ be as in Lemma 1 so that the bound (2.4) holds with probability at least



Figure 1: The averaged relative error $|\frac{\hat{k}_2(\mathbf{x})}{k_2(\mathbf{x})} - 1|$ depending on N, d and σ.



Figure 2: The density plots of the stanardized statistics. The dashed black curve is the standard normal density in all four plots.

$1 - 2\exp(-\kappa_1 m)$. Moreover, we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^k\|_{2,1} \leq \frac{1}{t}\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1} = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_0}}{\sqrt{m}}\sqrt{d\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}^2 \ln(\frac{eN}{m})}.$$

Let c_2 and c_3 be as in (2.4), then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|\hat{\mathbf{x}}-\mathbf{x}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} &\leq c_2\frac{\|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^k\|_{2,1}}{\sqrt{k}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} + c_3\frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2} \\ &\leq c_2\frac{\sqrt{\kappa_0}}{\sqrt{m}}\sqrt{d\frac{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2}\ln(\frac{eN}{m})} + c_3\frac{\epsilon}{\|\mathbf{x}\|_2},\end{aligned}$$

then the proof is completed by setting $\kappa_2 = c_2\sqrt{\kappa_0}$, $\kappa_3 = c_3$ and noticing the fact that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 = \|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,2}$.

Proof of Lemma 3. By using the independence of $\mathbf{a}_{1j}, j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$, for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the characteristic function of $\langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x}\rangle$ has the form:

$$\begin{aligned}E[\exp(\mathrm{i}t\langle \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{x}\rangle)] &= E\left[\exp(\mathrm{i}t(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathbf{x}[j]^T\mathbf{a}_{1j}))\right] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{p} E[\exp(\mathrm{i}t\mathbf{x}[j]^T\mathbf{a}_{1j})] \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{p}\exp(-\gamma_\alpha^\alpha\|t\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2^\alpha) \\ &= \exp\left[-\gamma_\alpha^\alpha\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p}\|\mathbf{x}[j]\|_2^\alpha\right)|t|^\alpha\right] \\ &= \exp(-(\gamma_\alpha\|\mathbf{x}\|_{2,\alpha})^\alpha|t|^\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

Then, the Lemma follows from the Definition 1.

References

[1] Baraniuk, R. G., Cevher, V., Duarte, M. F., & Hegde, C. (2010). Model-based compressive sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **56(4)** 1982–2001.

[2] Blumensath, T., & Davies, M. E. (2009). Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **27(3)** 265–274.

[3] Blumensath, T., & Davies, M. E. (2009). Sampling theorems for signals from the union of finite-dimensional linear subspaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55(4)** 1872–1882.

[4] Candes, E. J., Romberg, J. K., & Tao, T. (2006). Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **59(8)** 1207–1223.

[5] Candes, E. J., & Tao, T. (2005). Decoding by linear programming. *IEEE transactions on information theory* **51(12)** 4203–4215.

[6] Candes, E. J., & Tao, T. (2006). Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies?. *IEEE transactions on information theory* **52(12)** 5406–5425.

[7] Chen, J., & Huo, X. (2006). Theoretical results on sparse representations of multiple-measurement vectors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **54(12)** 4634–4643.

[8] Cotter, S. F., Rao, B. D., Engan, K., & Kreutz-Delgado, K. (2005). Sparse solutions to linear inverse problems with multiple measurement vectors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **53(7)** 2477–2488.

[9] Donoho, D. L. (2006). Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **52(4)** 1289–1306.

[10] Duarte, M. F., & Eldar, Y. C. (2011). Structured compressed sensing: From theory to applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing 59(9)* 4053–4085.

[11] Eldar, Y. C., Kuppinger, P., & Bolcskei, H. (2010). Block-sparse signals: Uncertainty relations and efficient recovery. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **58(6)** 3042–3054.

[12] Eldar, Y. C., & Kutyniok, G. (2012). Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications. Cambridge University Press.

[13] Eldar, Y. C., & Mishali, M. (2009). Robust recovery of signals from a structured union of subspaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **55(11)** 5302–5316.

[14] Elhamifar, E., & Vidal, R. (2012). Block-sparse recovery via convex optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **60(8)** 4094–4107.

[15] Foucart, S., & Rauhut, H. (2013). A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag.

[16] Lopes, M. E. (2013). Estimating Unknown Sparsity in Compressed Sensing. In *ICML* (3) (pp. 217–225).

[17] Lopes, M. E. (2016). Unknown Sparsity in Compressed Sensing: Denoising and Inference. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **62(9)** 5145–5166.

[18] Lv, X., Bi, G., & Wan, C. (2011). The group lasso for stable recovery of block-sparse signal representations. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **59(4)** 1371–1382.

[19] Markatou, M., & Horowitz, J. L. (1995). Robust scale estimation in the error-components model using the empirical characteristic function. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* **23(4)** 369-381.

[20] Markatou, M., Horowitz, J. L., & Lenth, R. V. (1995). Robust scale estimation based on the the empirical characteristic function. *Statistics & probability letters* **25(2)** 185–192.

[21] Mishali, M., & Eldar, Y. C. (2008). Reduce and boost: Recovering arbitrary sets of jointly sparse vectors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **56(10)** 4692–4702.

[22] Mishali, M., & Eldar, Y. C. (2009). Blind multiband signal reconstruction: Compressed sensing for analog signals. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **57(3)** 993–1009.

[23] Needell, D., & Tropp, J. A. (2009). CoSaMP: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **26(3)** 301–321.

[24] Nolan, J. P. (2013). Multivariate elliptically contoured stable distributions: theory and estimation. *Computational Statistics* **28(5)** 2067–2089.

[25] Parvaresh, F., Vikalo, H., Misra, S., & Hassibi, B. (2008). Recovering sparse signals using sparse measurement matrices in compressed DNA microarrays. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing* **2(3)** 275–285.

[26] Press, S. J. (1972). Multivariate stable distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **2(4)** 444-462.

[27] Stojnic, M., Parvaresh, F., & Hassibi, B. (2010). On the reconstruction of block-sparse signals with an optimal number of measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **57(8)** 3075–3085.

[28] Tropp, J. A., & Gilbert, A. C. (2007). Signal recovery from random measurements via orthogonal matching pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **53(12)** 4655–4666.

[29] Yuan, M., & Lin, Y. (2006). Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **68(1)** 49–67.

[30] Zeinalkhani, Z., & Banihashemi, A. H. (2015). Iterative Reweighted ℓ_2/ℓ_1 Recovery Algorithms for Compressed Sensing of Block Sparse Signals. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **63(17)** 4516–4531.

[31] Zolotarev, V. M. (1986). One-dimensional stable distributions (Vol. 65). Providence, RI, USA: AMS, 1986.